

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

**COLLEGE REPUBLICANS OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON;  
CHEVY SWANSON**, an Individual,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

**ANA MARI CAUCE**, individually and in  
her official capacity as president of the  
University of Washington; **GERALD J.  
BALDASTY**, individually and in his official  
capacity as provost and executive vice  
president; **RENE SINGLETON**,  
individually and in her official capacity as  
assistant director, Student Activities;  
**CHRISTINA COOP**, individually and in  
her official capacity as senior activities  
advisor, Student Activities; **JOHN N.  
VINSON**, individually and in his official  
capacity as Chief of the University of  
Washington, Seattle, Police Department;  
**CRAIG WILSON** individually and in his  
official capacity as University of  
Washington, Seattle, Police Department  
Patrol Commander; and DOES 1-25;

Defendants.

NO. 2:18-cv-00189-MJP

**FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR  
CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS AND  
RELATED CLAIMS**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

1 Plaintiffs University of Washington College Republicans and Chevy Swanson  
 2 (collectively "Plaintiffs") bring this action against Defendants Ana Mari Cauce,  
 3 individually and in her official capacity as president of the University of Washington;  
 4 Gerald J. Baldasty, individually and in his official capacity as provost and executive vice  
 5 president of the University of Washington; Rene Singleton, individually and in her  
 6 official capacity as assistant director, Student Activities at the University of Washington,  
 7 Seattle ("UW Seattle"); Christina Coop, individually and in her official capacity as senior  
 8 activities advisor, Student Activities at the UW Seattle; John N. Vinson, individually and  
 9 in his official capacity as Chief of the UW Seattle Police Department; Craig Wilson,  
 10 individually and in his official capacity as UW Seattle Department Patrol Commander;  
 11 and DOES 1-25, for nominal, compensatory, punitive, declaratory and injunctive relief.  
 12  
 13  
 14

## 15 INTRODUCTION

16 1. This action seeks to protect and vindicate fundamental rights. It is a civil  
 17 rights action brought under the First and Fourteenth Amendments against government  
 18 actors responsible for imposing draconian and unreasonable security fees on Plaintiffs  
 19 as a condition for permitting them to host a conservative speaker in Red Square within  
 20 the UW Seattle campus. The imposition of a \$17,000 security fee for a Saturday afternoon  
 21 event featuring an evangelical Christian speaker is remarkable. But UW Seattle justifies  
 22 it only on the basis of an unconstitutional heckler's veto, in essence, rewarding members  
 23 of society so intolerant of and hostile to hearing views they find objectionable they must  
 24 threaten and/or commit violence to protect themselves from such views. By imposing  
 25  
 26  
 27

1 such an exorbitantly large security fee on the Plaintiffs, Defendants, and each of them,  
 2 are responsible for ratifying an unconstitutional heckler's veto, taxing protected speech  
 3 and rewarding those who disrespect the solemn and precious freedoms safeguarded  
 4 within the First Amendment.  
 5

## 6 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7 2. This action arises under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the  
 8 United States Constitution, and is authorized pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 in relation to  
 9 Defendants' deprivation of the Plaintiffs' constitutional rights. Accordingly, this Court  
 10 has federal question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 & 1343.  
 11

12 3. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). Each and all of the acts alleged  
 13 herein were done by Defendants within King County, Washington.  
 14

15 4. This Court is authorized to grant a Declaratory Judgment under the  
 16 Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-02, implemented through Rule 57 of the  
 17 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and to issue the injunctive relief requested by Plaintiff under  
 18 Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; the requested injunctive relief under 28 U.S.C.  
 19 § 1343(3); the requested damages under 28 U.S.C. § 1343(3); and attorneys' fees and costs under  
 20 42 U.S.C. § 1988.  
 21

## 22 PARTIES

### 23 A. Plaintiffs

24 5. Plaintiff College Republicans of the University of Washington is a  
 25 registered student organization of the University of Washington, Seattle.  
 26  
 27

1           6.       Plaintiff Chevy Swanson is an individual residing in the City of Seattle, a  
2 student at the University of Washington, Seattle, and president of the College  
3 Republicans of the University of Washington.  
4

5           **B. UW Seattle Defendants**

6           7.       Defendant Ana Mari Cauce, is sued individually and in her and official  
7 capacity as president of the University of Washington.

8           8.       Defendant Gerald J. Baldasty is sued individually and in his official  
9 capacity as provost and executive vice president of the University of Washington.  
10

11          9.       Defendant Rene Singleton is sued individually and in her official capacity  
12 as assistant director, Student Activities, of the University of Washington.

13          10.      Defendant Christina Coop, individually and in her official capacity as  
14 senior activities advisor, Student Activities, of the University of Washington.  
15

16          11.      Defendant John N. Vinson is sued individually and in his official capacity  
17 as Chief of the University of Washington Police Department.

18          12.      Defendant Craig Wilson is sued individually and in his official capacity as  
19 Patrol Commander within the University of Washington Police Department.  
20

21          13.      Plaintiffs are unaware of the true names and/or capacities of defendants  
22 sued herein as DOES 1-25 ("UW Seattle DOES") and therefore sue said defendants by  
23 such fictitious names. Plaintiffs will amend this Complaint to allege their true names  
24 and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiffs believe and allege that each of the DOE  
25 defendants is legally responsible and liable for the incident, injuries, and damages set  
26  
27

1 forth in this Complaint. Each defendant proximately caused injuries and damages  
2 because of their active participation in the subject incident, and/or because of their  
3 negligence, breach of duty, negligent supervision, management or control, violation of  
4 public policy, or tortious conduct. Each defendant is liable for his/her personal conduct,  
5 vicarious or imputed negligence, fault, or breach of duty, whether severally or jointly,  
6 or whether based upon agency, employment, ownership, entrustment, custody, care or  
7 control or upon any other act or omission. Plaintiffs will ask leave to amend this  
8 Complaint subject to further discovery and investigation.  
9  
10

#### 11 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

12 14. In January 2017, the College Republicans hosted an event featuring  
13 political provocateur Milo Yiannopolous in Kane Hall on the UW Seattle campus. Exh.  
14 1, Decl. Swanson, ¶ 3. The event drew significant blowback from members of the  
15 community who contacted the University hoping to have the event cancelled. *Id.*  
16

17 15. Chevy Swanson was event coordinator for the College Republicans and  
18 directly involved in planning for the Yiannopolous event. *Id.*, ¶ 4. Swanson and other  
19 club members met multiple times with campus administration. *Id.* Initially, the  
20 administration estimated security, building rental, equipment and staffing would cost  
21 the group \$1,000. *Id.* In subsequent meetings, they were given a revised estimate of  
22 \$5,000 and \$7,000. *Id.* At no time, did the administration officials explain the rising cost  
23 estimates except to say that because they were expecting heightened protests, the cost  
24 of security would increase to cover additional officers. *Id.*  
25  
26  
27

1           16. On January 20, 2017, the night of the Yiannopolous event, approximately  
2 400 people gathered in Red Square to cue up for the event. *Id.*, ¶ 5. At approximately 5  
3 p.m., a number of black-clad individuals wearing masks carrying sticks and flagpoles  
4 showed up breaking bricks, attempting to bust down barricades and harassing people.  
5  
6 *Id.*

7           17. At approximately 7 p.m. an altercation occurred in which a protester was  
8 shot. Two people were charged with assaulting the protester. *Id.*, ¶ 6. As a result of the  
9 Yiannopolous event requiring substantial security, the University adopted a "Safety and  
10 Security Protocols for Events" policy. *Id.* The policy states in relevant part:

12           When the use of campus facilities involves events, activities, and  
13 programs that are likely to significantly affect campus safety,  
14 security, and operation, the University will perform an analysis of  
15 all event factors. This could result in additional conditions and  
16 requirements placed on the host organization in order to maintain  
17 the safety and security of all organizing parties, guests attending,  
18 and the broader campus community. Safety and security concerns  
19 may include, but are not limited to, history or examples of violence,  
20 bodily harm, property damage, significant disruption of campus  
21 operations, and those actions prohibited by the campus code of  
22 conduct and state and federal law.

23           During the planning process, host organizations or groups are  
24 responsible for making the University aware of any known histories  
25 and/or issues of safety and security concerns. The University (i.e.,  
26 venue coordinator and UWPD) may review all event details and  
27 logistics to determine necessary safety and security protocols.  
Additionally, if previously unknown or new safety and security  
concerns arise during the planning process, the University will  
review the event details and may alter any conditions and  
requirements. Any determination by authorized campus officials  
will be based on an assessment of credible information other than  
the content or viewpoints anticipated to be expressed during the  
event. Other events taking place on or near campus will be taken into

1 consideration in the security review. Required security measures  
2 may include, but are not limited to, adjusting the venue, date, and  
3 timing of the event; providing additional law enforcement; imposing  
4 access controls or security checkpoints limiting costumes or items  
5 carried; and/or creating buffer zones around the venue.

6 The host organization or group will be required to pay costs of  
7 reasonable event security as determined in advance by the  
8 University. These costs include, but are not limited to security  
9 personnel, costs to secure the venue from damage, and special  
10 equipment as determined by law enforcement. Security fees will be  
11 based on standard and approved recharge rates for UYPD, other  
12 security personnel, and associated equipment costs or rentals.  
13 Should the University place supplementary security protocols prior  
14 to or during the event to provide adequate security to help mitigate  
15 any originally unforeseen security concerns, additional security fees  
16 may be charged to host organizations or groups. Host organizations  
17 are financially responsible for damage, inside or outside of the  
18 venue, caused by members of their organization or their invitees.

19 The University reserves the right, in rare circumstances, to cancel an  
20 event if based on information available it is reasonably believed that  
21 there is a credible threat which unreasonably places the campus  
22 community at risk of harm.

23 *Id.*

24 18. The College Republicans raised money to cover the security fees through  
25 a gofundme campaign. *Id.*, ¶ 7. After the event, the College Republicans received an  
26 invoice from the University for \$9,121, which they paid from the money received from  
27 the gofundme campaign. *Id.* However, the College Republicans did not plan other  
events in 2017 due to their inability to cover the exorbitant security costs they  
anticipated needing. *Id.*

19. In October 2017, an individual associated with Patriot Prayer, Kyle  
Broussard, contacted Swanson offering to have the group's founder and leader, Joey  
Gibson, come to the campus on November 22, 2017, for an indoor speaking event. *Id.*, ¶

1 8. Patriot Prayer is an informal group of evangelical Christians formed and led by  
2 Gibson to convey a message of peace. *Id.* Its Facebook page says it is about “using the  
3 power of love and prayer to fight the corruption both in the government and citizen  
4 levels that seek to gain power through division and deception.”<sup>1</sup> *Id.* Despite this  
5 description, Gibson has been the target of physical assault by Antifa and similar violent  
6 left-wing activist groups who label him a white supremacist and Nazi. *Id.*

7  
8 20. In October 2017, Swanson, along with other members of the College  
9 Republicans, met with Defendant Renee Singleton, assistant director of Student  
10 Activities, and Christina Coop, senior activities advisor for Student Activities, to discuss  
11 planning for the Patriot Prayer event. *Id.*, ¶ 9. Defendant Singleton told Swanson that  
12 security costs would be high due to security concerns. *Id.* Singleton also told Swanson  
13 that Patriot Prayer is a controversial group and would present major security problems.  
14 *Id.* Based on those representations, the College Republicans decided not to move  
15 forward with the event. *Id.*

16  
17 21. In January 2018, the College Republicans discussed holding a Patriot  
18 Prayer event outdoors to defray the costs associated with room, equipment and some  
19 of the security costs. *Id.*, ¶ 10. The group reached out to Gibson to inquire about  
20 scheduling an outdoor event in February 2018. *Id.*

21  
22 22. Swanson met again with campus advisors to discuss planning for a  
23 February outdoor event. *Id.*, ¶ 11. On February 1, 2018, Defendant Craig Wilson, Patrol  
24  
25

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> [https://www.facebook.com/pg/PatriotPrayerUSA/about/?ref=page\\_internal](https://www.facebook.com/pg/PatriotPrayerUSA/about/?ref=page_internal).



1 Commander with the UW Seattle Police Department, told Swanson the cost of security  
2 would be \$17,000 due to expected violent protests. *Id.* Wilson did not explicitly detail  
3 the reasons for such a large security fee. *Id.* No other group has been charged such an  
4 excessively large security fee in the past. *Id.*, Exh. 1, UWPD Security Costs for 2016-17,  
5 obtained through a Washington State Public Records Request.  
6

7 23. Prior to the event, Defendant Cauce issued a warning to students and  
8 members of the campus community to avoid Red Square, effectively hindering the  
9 success of the Event by spreading the fear of violence. "Through civil debate, we can  
10 tackle difficult issues," University of Washington Office of the President Blog, February  
11 9, 2018, [https://www.washington.edu/president/2018/02/09/through-civil-debate-](https://www.washington.edu/president/2018/02/09/through-civil-debate-we-can-tackle-difficult-issues/)  
12 [we-can-tackle-difficult-issues/](https://www.washington.edu/president/2018/02/09/through-civil-debate-we-can-tackle-difficult-issues/)(" I encourage you to avoid Red Square, and the  
13 surrounding area from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday to ensure your own personal  
14 safety.").

15 24. Although the Event was held on February 10, 2018, in Red Square, the  
16 College Republicans and those attending it for the purpose of hearing Joey Gibson speak  
17 numbered only approximately 50 people and were substantially outnumbered by a  
18 significantly larger number of protesters, hecklers and thugs. Police were a significantly  
19 larger presence as well.  
20

21 25. After the Event, Defendant Cauce defamed the College Republicans by  
22 referring to them as a "group that many associate with racist views" and who many  
23 believe were seeking to provoke violence and grab attention. "A Difficult Saturday,"  
24  
25  
26  
27

1 University of Washington Office of the President Blog, February 12, 2018,  
2 <https://www.washington.edu/president/blog/>.

## 3 LEGAL CLAIMS

### 4 FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

5 Violation of the First Amendment (42 U.S.C. § 1983)  
6 (Freedom of Speech)  
7 (All Plaintiffs Against All UW Seattle Defendants)

8 26. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in the preceding  
9 paragraphs, as if fully set forth herein.

10 27. Red Square is a traditional public forum, or at least a designated public  
11 forum – as it must be, under state-wide regulations, and long-standing Supreme Court  
12 precedent. Accordingly, UW Seattle is required to allow plaintiffs to bring speakers of  
13 their own choosing to speak on campus, free from viewpoint discrimination, content-  
14 based speech restrictions that are not narrowly tailored to serve a compelling  
15 government interest, and content-neutral time, place and manner restrictions that are  
16 not narrowly tailored to serve an important government interest or that fail to leave  
17 open ample alternative channels for the communication of the message.

18 28. Defendants, acting under color of state law and according to UW Seattle  
19 policy, custom, pattern, and practice, have failed to meet these constitutional standards  
20 by adopting and enforcing a facially and as-applied unconstitutional security fee policy  
21 that grants Defendants unfettered discretion to impose unreasonable security fees;  
22 which Defendants have enforced according to the their whim and taste, or the demands  
23 of an off-campus mob of masked agitators.

1           29. Defendants' actions fail to meet constitutional scrutiny because the  
2 security fee policy is facially and as-applied unreasonable, and was adopted and  
3 enforced in a viewpoint discriminatory manner, with the effect of chilling,  
4 marginalizing, or banning the expression of conservative viewpoints on the UW Seattle  
5 campus.  
6

7           30. The security fee policy is unconstitutionally vague, and therefore void as  
8 a matter of law, both on its face, and as it is being applied to Plaintiffs.  
9

10          31. As a direct and proximate consequence of Defendants' violation of  
11 Plaintiffs' federal civil rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the First Amendment, Plaintiffs  
12 have suffered and will suffer irreparable injury that cannot fully be compensated by an  
13 award of monetary damages.  
14

15          32. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988, Plaintiffs are entitled to  
16 declaratory relief and temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief  
17 invalidating and restraining enforcement of the restrictions allowed or required by the  
18 security fee policy. Additionally, plaintiffs are entitled to monetary damages arising  
19 from the unconstitutional actions of Defendants and each of them, sued herein in their  
20 individual capacities, as well as reasonable costs of suit.  
21

22          33. Plaintiffs found it necessary to engage the services of private counsel to  
23 vindicate their rights under the law. Plaintiffs are therefore entitled to an award of  
24 attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988.  
25  
26  
27

**SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

Violation of the First Amendment (42 U.S.C. § 1983)  
(Freedom of Assembly)  
(All Plaintiffs Against All UW Seattle Defendants)

34. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs, as if fully set forth herein.

35. The First Amendment prohibits government from abridging the right of the people to assemble peaceably. Freedom of assembly is the individual right or ability of people to come together and collectively express, promote, pursue, and defend their ideas. The right to freedom of association is recognized as a human right, a political right and a civil liberty.

36. Defendants, and each of them, abridge Plaintiffs' right to assemble by imposing a draconian and unreasonable security fee for their scheduled event, thereby creating and enforcing a de facto prohibition on their right to assemble without government-approved endorsement of their message.

37. As a direct and proximate consequence of Defendants' violation of Plaintiffs' federal civil rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the First Amendment, Plaintiffs have suffered and will suffer irreparable injury that cannot fully be compensated by an award of monetary damages.

38. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988, Plaintiffs are entitled to declaratory relief and temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief invalidating and restraining enforcement of the restrictions allowed or required by the

1 security fee policy. Additionally, plaintiffs are entitled to monetary damages arising  
 2 from the unconstitutional actions of Defendants and each of them, sued herein in their  
 3 individual capacities, as well as reasonable costs of suit.  
 4

5 39. Plaintiffs found it necessary to engage the services of private counsel to  
 6 vindicate their rights under the law. Plaintiffs are therefore entitled to an award of  
 7 attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988.  
 8

### 9 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

10 Violation of the First Amendment (42 U.S.C. § 1983)

11 (Retaliation)

12 (All Plaintiffs Against All UW Seattle Defendants)

13 40. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in the preceding  
 14 paragraphs, as if fully set forth herein.

15 41. Plaintiffs and their members have engaged in constitutionally protected  
 16 speech, namely, holding and expressing conservative viewpoints by inviting  
 17 conservative speakers to speak on the UW Seattle campus.

18 42. By treating Plaintiffs and their members differently from similarly  
 19 situated students, student organizations, and members of the public because they are  
 20 conservative and because of their conservative beliefs, among other things, Defendants,  
 21 acting under color of state law and according to policy and practice, have retaliated  
 22 against Plaintiffs and their members for holding and expressing disfavored views, and  
 23 in so retaliating, have engaged in conduct that would chill a person of ordinary firmness  
 24 from continuing to engage in the protected speech activity.  
 25  
 26  
 27

45. Additionally, Plaintiffs are entitled to monetary damages arising from the unconstitutional actions of Defendants, and each of them, sued herein in their individual capacities, as well as reasonable costs of suit.

46. Plaintiffs found it necessary to engage the services of private counsel to vindicate their rights under the law. Plaintiffs are therefore entitled to an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988.

Violation of the Fourteenth Amendment (42 U.S.C. § 1983)  
(Due Process)  
(All Plaintiffs Against All UW Seattle Defendants)

47. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs, as if fully set forth herein.

1           48. Defendants, acting under color of state law and according to a policy,  
2 pattern and practice, have enacted a security fee policy, which is vague, overbroad, and  
3 improperly affords Defendants unfettered discretion in its application, and therefore  
4 deprives Plaintiffs of their clearly established due process rights guaranteed by the  
5 Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.  
6

7           49. As a direct and proximate consequence of Defendants' violations of  
8 Plaintiffs federal civil rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the Fourteenth Amendment,  
9 Plaintiffs have suffered and will suffer irreparable injury that cannot fully be  
10 compensated by an award of monetary damages.  
11

12           50. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988, Plaintiffs are entitled to  
13 declaratory relief and temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief  
14 invalidating and restraining enforcement of the security fee policy. Additionally,  
15 Plaintiffs are entitled to monetary damages arising from the unconstitutional actions of  
16 Defendants, and each of them, sued herein in their individual capacities, as well as  
17 reasonable costs of suit.  
18

19           51. Plaintiffs found it necessary to engage the services of private counsel to  
20 vindicate their rights under the law. Plaintiffs are therefore entitled to an award of  
21 attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988.  
22

23       / / /

24       / / /

25       / / /

**FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

Violation of the Fourteenth Amendment (42 U.S.C. § 1983)  
(Equal Protection)  
(All Plaintiffs Against All UW Seattle Defendants)

52. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs, as if fully set forth herein.

53. By treating Plaintiffs and their members, differently from similarly situated students, student organizations, and members of the public because they are conservative and because of their conservative beliefs, among other things, Defendants, acting under color of state law and according to policy and practice, have engaged in actions that discriminate on the basis of political status and belief and have therefore deprived Plaintiffs of their clearly established equal protection rights guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

54. As a direct and proximate consequence of Defendants' violations of Plaintiffs' federal civil rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the Fourteenth Amendment, Plaintiffs have suffered and will suffer irreparable injury that cannot be fully compensated by an award of monetary damages.

55. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988, Plaintiffs are entitled to declaratory relief and temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief invalidating and restraining enforcement of the security fee policy. Additionally, Plaintiffs are entitled to monetary damages arising from the unconstitutional actions of

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**



1 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully pray for relief and judgment against  
2 Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows, in amounts according to proof:

- 3 1. For judgment in favor of Plaintiffs against Defendants;
- 4 2. For all damages legally and/or proximately caused to Plaintiffs by  
5 Defendants in an amount to be determined at trial;
- 6 3. For a declaration that Defendants violated 42 U.S.C. § 1983;
- 7 4. For a declaration that Defendants violated the First and Fourteenth  
8 Amendments to the United States Constitution;
- 9 5. For a declaration that Defendants violated the First and Fourteenth  
10 Amendments to the United States Constitution;
- 11 6. For nominal damages for the past loss of their constitutional rights as set  
12 forth in this Complaint;
- 13 7. For compensatory damages according to proof;
- 14 8. For punitive and exemplary damages for all claims for which such  
15 damages are authorized;
- 16 9. For temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief prohibiting  
17 Defendants from enforcing their unconstitutional content-based Security Fee Policy  
18 against Plaintiffs and those similarly situated and from unconstitutionally ratifying a  
19 heckler's veto by inhibiting Plaintiff's First Amendment and Fourteenth Amendment  
20 rights of speech, expression, assembly and association.
- 21 10. For civil penalties under Cal. Civ. Code §§ 51.7, 52 & 52.1;
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27

1           11. For an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, costs and expenses pursuant  
2 to 42 U.S.C. § 1988 other applicable law;

3           12. For costs of suit incurred herein; and

4           13. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.  
5

6 DATED this March 7, 2018

7 ELLIS, LI & McKINSTRY PLLC

8 *s/ Kyle D. Netterfield*

9 Kyle D. Netterfield WSBA No. 27101

10 Ellis, Li & McKinstry PLLC

11 2025 First Avenue PHA

12 Seattle, WA 98121

13 Telephone: (206) 682-0565

14 Fax: (206) 625-1052

15 Email: knetterfield@elmlaw.com

16 Attorneys for Plaintiffs, College  
17 Republicans of the University of  
18 Washington and Chevy Swanson

19 FREEDOM X

20 *s/William J. Becker, Jr.*

21 William J. Becker, Jr.

22 CA SBN No. 134545

23 (Pro Hac Vice)

24 Freedom X

25 11500 Olympic Blvd., Suite 400

26 Los Angeles, CA 90064

27 Telephone: (310) 636-1018

Fax: (310) 765-6328

Email: bill@freedomxlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs, College  
Republicans of the University of  
Washington and Chevy Swanson

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs \* demand trial by jury on all individual claims they bring against their attackers in this action of all issues so triable.

ELLIS, LI & McKINSTRY PLLC

*s/ Kyle D. Netterfield*

Kyle D. Netterfield WSBA No. 27101  
Ellis, Li & McKinstry PLLC  
2025 First Avenue PHA  
Seattle, WA 98121  
Telephone: (206) 682-0565  
Fax: (206) 625-1052  
Email: knetterfield@elmlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs, College  
Republicans of the University of  
Washington and Chevy Swanson

FREEDOM X

*s/ William J. Becker, Jr.*

William J. Becker, Jr.  
CA SBN No. 134545  
(Pro Hac Vice)  
Freedom X  
11500 Olympic Blvd., Suite 400  
Los Angeles, CA 90064  
Telephone: (310) 636-1018  
Fax: (310) 765-6328  
Email: bill@freedomxlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs, College  
Republicans of the University of  
Washington and Chevy Swanson

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 7<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2018, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the United States District Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to all parties who are registered with the CMECF system.

DATED this 7<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2018

By: /s/ William J. Becker, Jr.  
William J. Becker, Jr. (Pro Hac Vice)